

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P. D Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/629,458	07/31/2000	Phillip C. Keslin	1034.00	5371	
26111 7590 08/02/2004 STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			EXAMI	EXAMINER	
			CUNNINGHAM	CUNNINGHAM, GREGORY F	
	NGTON, DC 20005		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•			2676	14	
			DATE MAILED: 08/02/2004	, //	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
`Advisory Action	09/629,458	KESLIN, PHILLIP C.				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Greg Cunningham	2676				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	a timely filed amendment which (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in				
_	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period o fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amound the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the main attention of the status of the shortened status of the shortened status of the status of the shortened status of the st	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ⊠ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: 6-21.						
Claim(s) objected to:	Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b)  disapproved by t	he Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	t(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	<del></del>				

J.F. Curningham, Examiner

MATTHEW C. BELLA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

10. Other: \_\_\_\_

**Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)** 

Application No. 09/629,458





Continuation of 2. NOTE: While amended claim 1 appears to overcome the final rejection in the prior office action, a search for prior art would be required for the change in scope of independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-5. Suggest applicant review "Distributed Rendering for Scalable Displays" by Greg Humphreys, Ian Buck, Matthew Eldridge and Pat Hanrahan @ URL: http://www-graphics.stanford.edu/papers/clust\_render/clust\_render.pdf. Also review ATM LAN End-User hosts @ URL: http://www.scd.ucar.edu/nets/docs/archives/ATM-strategy